



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/666,277	09/21/2000	David William Boerstler	AUS9-2000-0240-US1	8443

7590 01/05/2004
Duke W Yee
Carstens Yee & Cahoon LLP
P O Box 802334
Dallas, TX 75380

EXAMINER

PATHAK, SUDHANSHU C

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2634

DATE MAILED: 01/05/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/666,277

Applicant(s)

BOERSTLER, DAVID WILLIAM

Examiner

Sudhanshu C. Pathak

Art Unit

2634

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21st September, 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-50 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 47-50 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 7, 10, 12 and 35-37 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 5, 6, 8, 9, 11, 13-34 and 38-46 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 21st September, 2000 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 1 . 6) ☐ Other: _____

Art Unit: 2634

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-to-50 are pending in the application.

Specification

The information disclosure statement (IDS) filed on 11th November, 2000 fails to comply with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97, 1.98 and MPEP § 609 because the IDS refers to multiple patents with the same number. The IDS refers to patents by "Khoudari" and "Gomez et al." both as Patent No. 4,513,329. This should be corrected as follows:

Gomez et al. should correspond to Patent No. 4,513,329 and Khoudari should correspond to Patent No. 4,361,895.

Furthermore, 37 CFR 1.98(a)(2), requires a legible copy of each U.S. and foreign patent; each publication or that portion which caused it to be listed; and all other information or that portion which caused it to be listed.

The IDS has been placed in the application file, but the information referred to therein has not been considered as to the merits. Applicant is advised that the date of any re-submission of any item of information contained in this information disclosure statement or the submission of any missing element(s) will be the date of submission for purposes of determining compliance with the requirements based on the time of filing the statement, including all certification requirements for statements under 37 CFR 1.97(e).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35

U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 1-3 & 7, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Van Driest et al. (5,003,562).

Regarding to Claim 1, Van Driest discloses a decoder for use in decoding self-clocked transmission system (Abstract, lines 1-4 & Column 1, lines 10-16). Van Driest further discloses the decoder (Fig. 3A & Fig. 3B) comprising a first and second monostable circuit (Fig. 3B, elements 70 & 74), and comparator logic circuit (Fig. 3B, element 86 & Fig. 7). Van Driest further discloses inputting the received data signal (Fig. 3A, element 40, "RD") to both first and second monostable circuits (Column 3, lines 47-52) and generating a first and second output signals (Fig. 3B, elements 80 & 82) and further comparing the output signals of the monostable circuits (Figure 3B, elements 80, 82 & 86) and outputting a compared output signal based on the comparison (Column 7, lines 23-46).

Regarding to Claim 2, Van Driest discloses a decoder for use in decoding self-clocked transmission system as described above. Van Driest further discloses the signal recovery decoder to consist of at least one clock signal

Art Unit: 2634

(Fig. 2, element 18 & Fig. 3A, element 72 & 76) and a data signal (Fig. 2, element 18 & Fig. 3A, element 40).

Regarding to Claim 3, Van Driest discloses a decoder for use in decoding self-clocked transmission system as described above. Van Driest further discloses the received data signal to be at least one of processed equalized data signal and a processed unequalized data signal (Fig. 3A, element 40). Furthermore, Van Driest discloses that the transmitted signal, which is received by the decoder, is distorted and noise signals are introduced resulting in jitter (Column 2, lines 53-63).

Regarding to Claim 7, Van Driest discloses a decoder for use in decoding self-clocked transmission system as described above. Van Driest further discloses the decoder (Fig. 3A & Fig. 3B) comprising a first and second monostable circuit (Fig. 3B, elements 70 & 74), and furthermore the monostable circuits to comprise a data flip-flop, which is a one-shot, circuit component.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Van Driest et al. (5,003,562) in view of Kobayashi (6,028,461).

Regarding to Claim 4, Van Driest discloses a decoder for use in decoding self-clocked transmission system as described above. However, Van Driest does not disclose the comparator logic circuit (Fig. 3B, element 86 & Fig. 7) to include an OR-gate.

Kobayashi discloses a clock adjusting circuit comprising multiple phase comparison circuits to detect the difference between a reference clock and a loopback signal of the clock output (Abstract, lines 1-6). Furthermore, Kobayashi discloses the phase comparison circuit to include an OR-gate (Fig. 2, element 136). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to implement the comparator logical circuit as described in Kobayashi in the phase comparator logic in the decoder as described in Van Driest.

6. Claims 10, 35 & 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Van Driest et al. (5,003,562) in view of Park (5,880,898).

Regarding to Claim 10, Van Driest discloses a decoder for use in decoding self-clocked transmission system as described above. However, Van Driest does not disclose an equalizer to equalize the received input data signal.

Park discloses a circuit to equalize or remove error signals in digital data signals (Abstract, lines 6-11). Park discloses the equalizer circuit (Fig. 3, element 100 & Figure 4) to include a differentiator (Fig. 4, element 61) for differentiating the input signal, an amplifier (Fig. 4, elements 62 & 63) for

Art Unit: 2634

amplifying the differentiated data, a sign element (Fig. 4, element 70) to apply a sign to the amplified data. The signed amplified data signal is decreased due to the attenuation and coupling of the signals in the transmission lines. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to implement the equalizer as described in Park to the decoder circuit as described in Van Driest so as to remove any glitches or distortions in the received data so as to accurately then decode the data signals.

Regarding to Claim 35, Van Driest discloses a decoder for use in decoding self-clocked transmission system (Abstract, lines 1-4 & Column 1, lines 10-16). Van Driest further discloses the decoder (Fig. 3A & Fig. 3B) comprising a first and second monostable circuit having at least two input ports and two output ports (Fig. 3B, elements 70 & 74), and comparator logic circuit (Fig. 3B, element 86 & Fig. 7). Van Driest further discloses a compare logic circuitry (Fig. 3B, element 86 & Fig. 7), having at least two input ports and one output port (Fig. 3B, elements 80, 82 & 90), wherein the first output port of the first monostable circuit is connected to the first input of the logic circuitry and the first output of the second monostable circuit is connected to the second input port of the logic circuitry. However, Van Driest does not disclose implementing an equalizer in the decoder circuitry wherein the output of the equalizer is input into the monostable circuit components and does not explicitly disclose at least two output ports in the monostable circuit.

Art Unit: 2634

Park discloses a circuit to equalize or remove error signals in digital data signals (Abstract, lines 6-11). Park further discloses the equalizer comprising at least one output port (Fig. 3, element 100 & Fig. 4, element "NON-GLITCH"). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to implement the equalizer as described in Park to the decoder circuit as described in Van Driest so as to remove any glitches or distortions in the received data so as to then decode the data signals and obtain a more accurate clock signal and the transmitted data. Furthermore, Van Driest implements the monostable circuits using "D" Flip-Flops, which comprises two output ports.

Regarding to Claim 36, Van Driest in view of Park discloses a decoder for use in decoding self-clocked transmission system as described above. However, Van Driest in view of Park does not disclose a data flip-flop circuit component having a data input port, a clock input port and a complementary clock input port and having an output port and a complementary output port.

The Examiner takes official notice that a positive edge-triggered "D" flip-flop provides a data input port and a clock input port and a negative edge-triggered "D" flip-flop provides a data input port and a complementary clock input port. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention that implementing a combination of a negative and positive edge-triggered flip-flop circuits wherein a constant signal is connected to the complementary clock input port of the data flip-flop satisfies the limitations of the claim.

7. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Van Driest et al. (5,003,562) in view of Park (5,880,898) in further view of Streckmann et al. (4,535,299).

Regarding to Claim 12, Van Driest in view of Park discloses a decoder for use in decoding self-clocked transmission system as described above. Park further discloses that an optimum differentiation width can be set by varying the time constant to remove a glitch than the data (Column 4, lines 12-15). However Van Driest in view of Park does not disclose the differentiator to as a resistive-capacitive differentiator.

Streckmann discloses a resistive-capacitive differentiator (Fig. 1, elements C1 & R1), for differentiating the incoming signal (Column 3, lines 57-63).

Furthermore, Streckmann discloses varying the values of the resistor and /or the capacitor so as to obtain the optimum time constant for the frequency of the incoming signal (Column 3, lines 57-67 & Column 4, lines 15-27).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention that by implementing the differentiator as described in Streckmann in the decoder as described in Van Driest in view of Park the optimum time constant can be achieved by varying the R-C values of the differentiator, and thus provide increased flexibility for the data rate into the equalizer.

8. Claim 37 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Van Driest et al. (5,003,562) in view of Park (5,880,898) in further view of Kobayashi (6,028,461).

Regarding to Claim 37, Van Driest in view of Park discloses a decoder for use in decoding self-clocked transmission system as described above.

However, Van Driest in view of Park does not disclose the comparator logic circuit (Fig. 3B, element 86 & Fig. 7) to include an OR-gate.

Kobayashi discloses a clock adjusting circuit comprising multiple phase comparison circuits to detect the difference between a reference clock and a loopback signal of the clock output (Abstract, lines 1-6). Furthermore, Kobayashi discloses the phase comparison circuit to include an OR-gate (Fig. 2, element 136). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to implement the comparator logical circuit as described in Kobayashi in the phase comparator logic in the decoder as described in Van Driest in view of Park.

Allowable Subject Matter

9. Claims 5, 6, 8, 9, 11, 13-34 & 38-46 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.
10. Claims 47-50 are allowable over prior art of record because the cited references do not contain the specified limitation of a first and second monostable circuit having an trigger signal input and each having positive and a negative edge output and logical operator having one input to be the negative edged output and the other input to be the positive edged output and further outputting a recovered clock out signal.

Art Unit: 2634

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sudhanshu C. Pathak whose telephone number is (703) 305-0341. The examiner can normally be reached (Monday-Friday from 8:30 AM to 5:30 PM).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Chin, can be reached at (703) 305-4714.

Any response to this action should be mailed to: Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks Washington, D.C. 20231

Or faxed to: -


(703) 872-9314 (for Technology Center 2600 only)

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Part II, 2121

Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA, Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Technology Center 2600

Customer Service Office whose telephone number is (703) 306-0377.



STEPHEN CHIN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600